A-2 (10/01)

NOTICE OF APPEAL

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare that I am a resident or employed in Los Angeles County, California; that my business address is the Office of the Federal Public Defender, 321 East 2nd Street, Los Angeles, California 90012-4202; that I am over the age of eighteen years; that I am not a party to the above-entitled action; that I am employed by the Federal Public Defender for the Central District of California, who is a member of the Bar of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, and at whose direction I served a copy of the NOTICE OF APPEAL.

On March 30, 2006, following ordinary business practice, 12 | service was:

[x] Placed in a closed [] By handenvelope, for collection delivery addressed as and hand-delivery by our internal staff, follows: addressed as follows:

[] Placed in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing via United States Mail, addressed as follows:

[] By facsimile as follows:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

11

13 l

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

. 4

Dorothy C. Kim Assistant United States Attorney United States Court House 312 North Spring Street, Suite 1304 Los Angeles, California 90012

This proof of service is executed at Los Angeles, California, on March 30, 2006.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

1 2 3 4		MAR	2 4 2000 ELECTRICATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	
5				
6			Priority Send	
7			Enter	
8	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT	JS-5/JS-6	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Scan Only			
10			Ce. 157.	
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	NO. CR 04-374 SJO	24 A.	
12	Plaintiff,			
13		ORDER		
14	V.	7		
15	RITA MARIE LAVELLE, an individual,			
16	TATTA MITATILE ET VELLE, OF HIGHWOOD,	MAR 2 7 2003	MAR 2 7 2003	
17	Defendant.	1 11111		
18				

The Court received the Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, remanding this matter back to the District Court to determine whether the statement imposed would have been materially different had the District Court known that the Guidelines were advisory. *United States v. Ameline*, 409 F.3 1073, 1074 (9th Cir. 2005).

After reviewing the case file, the parties' briefs regarding resentencing, as well as additional evidence offered by Defendant, the Court determines that the sentence imposed by the Court is sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the goals of sentencing. 18 U.S.C. 3553(a). Accordingly, the sentence would NOT have been different had the District Court known that the Guidelines were advisory. The Defendant is to surrender herself to the custody of the United

MQ

1	States Marshal located at the Roybal Federal Building, 255 East Temple Street, Los Angeles,
2	California 90012, on or before April 10, 2006.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4.	~ <i>L</i>
5	Dated this $\frac{24}{}$ day of March, 2006.
б	S IAMES OTEDO
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	